

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. V

NEW YORK, MARCH 23, 1912

No. 20

In an article entitled American Scholarship, which appeared originally in *The Nation* for May, 1911, and was reprinted in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 4:226-230, Professor Shorey showed, with his usual incisiveness, that the fundamental canker of American scholarship in the past has been the fact that the advanced training of American teachers had been obtained in Germany, where too great attention to certain peculiar kinds of erudition had almost destroyed the feeling for literature. He pointed out that fewer Americans are at the present time resorting to Germany for training and that the graduate study in American universities is more serious, more thorough and more efficient for our own students than any study at German Universities. He asserted, what has long been felt by those who have had occasion to use German handbooks, that the most vaunted quality of German scholarship, exactness and accuracy, is a delusion and a snare and that the most ambitious books by the most distinguished scholars often cannot be safely used without laborious verification.

In thus tearing the mask from German scholarship Professor Shorey does our own Universities a great service. Our tendency, under German influence, to overspecialization has also been more than once vigorously attacked by Professor Sihler, who has emphasized the necessity of going back to the original sources of study, even to the extent of casting aside practically the whole corpus of German learning as an incrustation that has served only to conceal the original gold.

Professor Shorey pays his respects also to the modern cry of culture versus science and the criticisms that have been lavished upon our graduate study by more than one observer. He insists, as does Professor Kellogg, that exact and intensive study is what should be required in the graduate school and that culture should be a by-product; he denies that any good can result from a three years graduate curriculum devoted ostensibly and mainly to culture courses, wide reading in general literature and daily or monthly themes. He continues:

And this brings us to the central difficulty with which the American university professor is struggling, not quite so unconsciously, or, if we take long views, so hopelessly as the genial onlooker assumes. The deficiency of the ordinary graduate student, not only in respect to culture, but in the elementary technic of his specialty, is due to the comparative

failure of collegiate education, that in turn to the lax training of the secondary schools, and that again to the low intellectual standards of a young, prosperous, commercialized nation, and the reaction of the indulgent American parent against what he deems puritanic or old-world ideas of discipline and restraint.

I have more than once criticized severely the lack of efficiency and the poor results of college training. It is here that the chief difficulty lies, in my opinion. High Schools prepare for College and are dominated very largely by college requirements. I have, therefore, no sympathy with the customary attacks upon the secondary schools. Their teachers are the product of the Colleges and their work is largely conditioned by the Colleges.

Let us see, for example, what is done in the Colleges with regard to Latin. A pupil upon entrance has had four years' training in Latin with a view primarily to meeting the college entrance requirements. The universal testimony is that even those who meet those conditions are not competent to continue the study in any proper sense of 'competent'. Common sense would demand, first, that we consider whether the High Schools are doing the best they can and, second, whether the Colleges are making proper demands. The most competent of the High School teachers assert with positiveness that they are doing the best they can. The endowed secondary schools support this testimony, although the results of their training are better, largely because they have a picked class of students and in many cases longer time. The difficulty, therefore, must, as I said, rest with the Colleges. Now how many college students who take Latin the first year continue it and how many of those who spend four years of college study upon it are able to do much better work than they did when they entered college? My own students, many of whom are college seniors and have had therefore, seven years of training are not able as a rule to prepare any longer lessons than they prepared in the last year of their High School instruction. Many High School pupils towards the end of their course are able to read Vergil at a rate of 75 lines per day. Most college students revolt at such a length of lesson even in their senior year. The college teachers cannot close their eyes to this state of affairs nor can they justly shift the responsibility upon poor preparation by the High Schools. Does the College want its enter-

ing students in Latin to have any real knowledge of the subject? The question seems superfluous but what are the actual facts? The ordinary college entrance examination does not test the knowledge of Latin, except to a limited extent in the prose composition. Certainly the examination in prepared work with a passing mark of 60 is no test. But there is an inexplicable disinclination all over the country to test High School students by the ability to read simple Latin at sight; yet that is the only test of knowledge. There is also a curious disinclination to provide rational tests in prose composition. The examination in prose composition is still a puzzle, a test of ingenuity, and special cramming. The college work in this subject, too, is often as bad as the High School examinations lead us to suppose the High School work to have been. Senior students have little greater facility than they had upon entrance. Our students must, therefore, come up to their graduate work ill-prepared on account of the collegiate work itself.

Let the Colleges, therefore, ask the High Schools to provide them with students who can read simple Latin narrative with approximate correctness and can write simple Latin narrative with a certain facility; then they will have something to build on. It seems foolish to ask students who have studied the subject for seven years to condescend to the studying of distinctions and details which they should have known five years before and yet that is what we all have to do in our senior courses. Let us put the blame where it belongs—on the Colleges. G. L.

A Latin Grammar. By Harry Edwin Burton, Professor of Latin in Dartmouth College. Boston: Silver, Burdett and Company (1911). Pp. xiii + 337. \$90¹.

The author aims to give all that the preparatory school student needs, and in addition enough detail to warrant the use of the book in the College as well; he rightly considers that a grammar adapted to both is much better pedagogically. Further, as he says, most even of the peculiarities of Latin occur, at least occasionally, in preparatory school Latin. At the same time he strives for brevity, and we find the book from 50 to 250 pages shorter than any other American grammar for school and college use, except Professor Bennett's, which has but 272 pages. Large and small type indicate relative importance; most of the examples are drawn from preparatory school authors, while the bulk of the remainder are from Livy and Horace, and, for older Latin, from Plautus and Terence, as is natural. The

plan of the book is good, the typography clear, and misprints are exceptionally few for a first edition (note § 49, *acer-si-mus* for *acer-simus*; § 76, *senectūs* for *senec-tūs*; § 881, *Vergīnius* for *Verginius*).

In the preface we read:

While seeking to include even the more uncommon forms and constructions, the author has studiously excluded all material which would be confusing to the beginner and would be neglected by the more advanced student. He has endeavored to present the essentials with the greatest possible simplicity for the benefit of the younger pupil.

Clearness of presentation and of expression is therefore to be expected; but the reviewer's attention was soon caught by statements like these:

§ 7. The vowels—*a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, and *y*—are classified as follows:—*open*, *a*; *medial*, *e* and *o*; *close*, *i*, *u*, and *y*. There is, however, variation within these classes; long *e* and *o*, for example, are closer than the corresponding short vowels.

§ 11. Pronunciation of vowels . . . These English equivalents are only approximate; all long vowel sounds in English except that of *a* as in *father* end in a vanishing sound which makes them somewhat diphthongal.

Other passages not clearly expressed are § 72, lines 4 and 5; § 49¹; § 49²; § 62; § 84 (the part on *prōcōsul*); § 288; and certain paragraphs of the Syntax, to be cited below¹. Many terms are needlessly introduced, with or without explanation: examples are syllabic liquids (§ 41—why not include *n*, which undergoes the same process as *l* and *r*?); voiced, of consonants (§ 9); iambic words (§ 43); primary and secondary, of noun-stems (§§ 68-71—at least a cross-reference to § 53 is needed); impari-syllabic, of nouns (§ 120); intensives, of verbs (§ 256); inceptives (§ 257); logical conjunctions (§ 1052). In § 212, the antecedent of *others* is not clear; in § 213, the perfectly correct meaning *much less* for *nēdum* does not make clear the meaning of the word; § 812² and § 919², on the origin of certain constructions, are over the heads of the users of the book. These items are merely typical of many of this class, some of them mentioned later on in this review; and, in general, the tone of the book is too scientific to procure the best results.

Pedagogical considerations sometimes demand that departures from strict accuracy be made. Hence the reviewer commends § 215, though *saepe* is really the neuter of a lost adj. *saepeis*; § 975 (except that the definition there given of a rhetorical question would include deliberative and dubitative questions); and the statement that *h* was not sounded after *p*, *t*, *c* (p. 8, top), though doubtless the best pronunciation was as in *uphill*, *hot-house*, *ink-horn*. But he can hardly concur in the advice (p. 7, bottom), to

¹ Of all Latin books a Latin grammar intended primarily or largely for use in Schools seems to require extended review. That Professor Kent's careful examination of this new Latin Grammar may receive the attention it deserves we have not hesitated to present it as a leading article.

C. K.

² Reference to the pertinent portion of Professor Burton's book has not always been easy, since there is often no sub-lettering or sub-numbering within the separate paragraphs, and, on the other hand, whole paragraphs at times form subdivisions (*a*, *b*, *c*, etc., or 1, 2, 3, etc.) of a large group of related facts. Such references as § 49¹, § 49², etc., are to the first and third paragraphs of section 49, etc.

make three syllables of *vēnī* by pronouncing it as *ūvēnī*, in an effort not to pronounce *v* like English *v*. Again, it would be better to avoid remarking upon the weakness of the sounds of *h*, *m*, *n* in certain positions (§ 21), and to insist upon a good clear pronunciation.

In § 95, the Vocative should be in the paradigm, as much in § 125, where it should stand in its usual place after the accusative; but the tendency to omit the vocative in the tabular paradigms is unfortunate, and brings no gain. Again, the vocative is slighted in § 398, where the statement that "stems in -o of the second declension are the only ones which have a special form for the vocative", not only includes *ager*, *puer*, *vir*, *bellum* and those like them, but excludes the Greek nouns of § 125.

A very unfortunately worded statement is found in § 27 and § 32: more stress should be laid on the fact that in the earliest Latin all words were accented on the first syllable, and that this was not the accent that we use in pronouncing Latin. Unless this difference be stressed almost unduly, it is impossible to make clear that 'Vowel Weakening in Unaccented Syllables' means in syllables unaccented by this early accent, not in syllables unaccented by that accent by which we pronounce: the reviewer has repeatedly had whole classes even of graduate students who seemed unable to grasp the fact that *cōnficiō* properly weakened the vowel of the antepenult "in unaccented syllables". This difference between the two accents should, therefore, be brought out with greater emphasis. In § 33, where the student is likely to begin reading (if at all!), there is nothing to show that it is not the ordinary Latin accent that is meant. Further, to treat the development of diphthongs in initial syllables in § 40 is misleading, since §§ 34-41 come under the general heading "Weakening in Unaccented Syllables", § 33.

Professor Burton still writes *ēius*, *Trōiae*, *māior*, *cūius*, *hūius* (§§ 6, 12, 232, 234, 239, 246, etc.), though in § 25 he agrees with the generally accepted view that these were pronounced *ei-yus*, *Troi-yae* (cf. *Τροίης*, Od. 1. 2), etc., with a diphthong, not a long vowel, in the first syllable. This inconsistency makes the marking of the vowel unintelligible to students, or else fosters an incorrect pronunciation. Again, in § 14 b 2, length is assigned to the antevocalic vowel in *Gāi*, *Pompēi*, etc.; but it is rather a case like *rēiciō* (§ 26—not well stated), = *rei-yiciō*; *Pompēi* is a way of writing *Pompēi-y*, for Caesar wrote POMPEII (Prisc. 2. 303, 2. 14 K.). All this means merely that II and III were avoided in writing.

In § 22, the author has not adopted the results of Professor Dennison, Classical Philology 1. 47-66, on the division of consonant groups between the syllables; there no longer seems any doubt that we should divide *mōns-trum*, *cōnsūmp-tus*, etc.,—i. e. be-

fore the last (not after the first) of a group, except that a mute plus a liquid goes with the following vowel. The last statement of the paragraph does not apply to the pronunciation, which is *a-des*; the etymological division is followed only in dividing between lines of writing.

Vēndō (§ 15) is said to be contracted from *vēnumdō*; it is really after the analogy of *vēneō*, which is for *vēnum eō* with elision of -um before the vowel. The statement on p. 13, line 1, does not cover such words as *mīles*. To state that final *o* becomes *e* (§ 39) and that *oi* may become *i* (§ 40; example *vīdit* from *voidit*) confuses any one but a comparative philologist. *Iussī* (§ 40), being an *s*-aorist, does not have original *ou*, but is *yēudh-s-ai*, becoming *iūssī* (so in the *Senatusconsultum de Bacchanalibus*), which was replaced by *iūssī* through the influence of the regular *ū* of *iūssus*. *Aevitās* (§ 41) does not become *aetās* by syncope, but loses *v* between like vowels (older form AIVITAS) and then becomes *aetās* by contraction. *Aere* (§ 45) is not for *airid*, but is an original locative form ending in *i* (Sommer, Handbuch d. latein. Laut- u. Formenlehre, p. 411). Intervocalic *s* in *miser*, *caesariēs* (§ 46) is not due to dissimilation, but is dialectal (Ernout, Élém. dial. lat. 197 f.; cf. Walde, Lat. etym. Wörterbuch², s. vv.). *Nōlō* (§ 47) is from *nē-volō*, not from *nē-volō*. The statement on consonant loss in § 50 is too sweeping: it should be that "a consonant before a consonant or at the end of a word may disappear", etc. Vowel development (§ 51) is easily defined as occurring mainly between a mute and *l*, and in some other consonant groups in words borrowed from Greek.

The sections on pronunciation and phonetic changes seem not to be so well worked out as the rest of the book.

Let us go on now with the second part, entitled Words (pages 16-135), which covers the forms etc. The subject of word-formation is not given in a single chapter, but is divided, and the formation of nouns heads the treatment of nouns, that of adjectives heads the section on adjectives, etc. The sections on word-formation impress the reviewer favorably, as being clear and practical, though he would make a few suggestions.

Vic-tor, *victōr-ia* (§ 53), with indication of the etymological division, would make the point clearer. § 79¹ needs examples or is useless. In § 151 and elsewhere the difficulties presented by the treatment of the final stem-vowel before the suffixes are passed over without mention. *Barb-ātus*, *turr-itus*, *corn-ātus* (§ 156) should be divided *barbā-tus*, *turrī-tus*, *cornū-tus*. -*urnus* (§ 158) is hardly a suffix worth listing, since it occurs (so far as the reviewer knows) only in *nocturnus* and in *diurnus*, the latter in imitation of the former.

On the paradigms the following comments may be made. To bring out the point in § 61, the genders of the words in both numbers should be added, as also for *duae* and *ambae*, § 93 end. "They are nearly all Greek names" (§ 80) should be "They are all Greek names or names formed in imitation of the Greek". The dative-ablative plural of *a-* and *o-* stems takes as ending not *-is* (§ 88), but *-ais*; but why make any statement at all on this point, any more than on the nominative and accusative plural when the truth is rather hard to express simply and clearly? The examples in § 103 should be given in the genitive plural as well as in the nominative singular. *lūdex* (§ 107) does not have a weakening of *e* to *i* in the oblique cases, but has original *i*. "In these <previously listed words> the nominative singular is the stem without the final consonant" (§ 108): this does not apply to *caput*. *Sāl, lār, fār* (§ 110), *pār* (§ 180)—genitive *sālis, lāris, fāris, pāris*—really have *ā* followed by a doubled consonant (Walde, s. vv.); whether it is preferable to indicate the syllabic length by the sign of vowel length is a question, but at any rate these words are in exactly the same condition as nominative-accusative neuter *hoc* (§ 239), which Professor Burton writes without the sign of length. *Nāvis* (§ 113) is not a good example of a pure *i*-stem, since it is really a diphthongal stem that has partially taken on *i*-stem inflection in Latin. *Iuvenis* and *canis* should be included (§ 118) among the nouns with genitive plural in *-um*, not *-ium*. *Vis* (§ 122) is an *i*-stem not a diphthongal stem *vei-*. "The following nouns are peculiar, having a nominative stem different from that of the other cases" (§ 123): this is not true of *carō, carnis*, nor of *nix, nivis*, though the relation of the nominative to the stem of the other cases differs from that found in other Latin words.

On the comparison of compounds of *-ficus* (§ 166) see Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, 491 f.; if the comparative were formed upon the participial stem, it would be *-ficientior*, not the actual *-ficentior*. *Aequus, aequum* and the like (§ 173) are found in many of our current texts and should be listed here; so also in § 315⁴. The genitive singular *altus* (§ 176) might well be omitted, since it does not occur in any of our texts; the remark on the use of *aliēnus* (§ 404) would be more useful if set in § 177. *Nēmō* is for *nē-hemō*, not for *nē-homō* (§ 213); likewise it is *nē*, not *nē*, that appears in *negō* and *nesciō*. *Tredecim* (§ 216) is commonly considered to have *ē* in the first syllable; the spelling *milia* needs more than a brief comment in small type where one is not likely to find it (§ 219). The idiom *cōsul tertiō* (cf. Gellius 10. 1) might be mentioned along with *cōsul tertium* (§ 228). *Is* and *quī* really supply the third personal pronoun (§ 230); cf. § 662, where examples are

needed. Why try to give the origin of the *d* in accusative *mēd, tēd, sēd* (§ 231)? The old explanation given by Professor Burton is incorrect (Sommer, 441 f.); but there is no reason to try to explain such a matter in a book of this kind. § 232 needs a cross reference to § 680. Why not list *hibus* in § 241 and *ibus* in § 247, since they occur in Plautus as well as nominative plural *hīsce* (§ 241)? That "the initial *i* of *iste* is sometimes omitted" (§ 243) is, though unquestionably a phenomenon of popular speech, a fact of no consequence in the reading of any classical author. No one of the stems given in § 247 will serve for genitive *eius*, dat. *ei*.

The peculiar passive *revertor*, perfect active *reverti*, which occurs in Caesar, deserves mention under semi-deponents (§ 274). Perfects in *-ui* (§ 283) should not be so definitely separated from those in *-vi* (§ 280). The statement in § 306 that in the perfect participle *ss* arises by the addition of a suffix *-so-* to a dental is wrong (cf. § 72, and Sommer, 640). In the imperative 2 singular of 3d conjugation, verbs in *-iō* (§ 313), the process really is that final *i* becomes *e*. In § 332 and in § 347 the addition of the meanings would be useful. § 337 would be clearer if stated "Compounds like *benefaciō*, in which *faciō* remains unchanged", etc. The verb *dō* does not have the meaning 'put' (§ 339) except as another verb, akin to *faciō*, assumes the form *dō* in compounds. § 348 needs a cross-reference to §§ 1019 ff., where the meanings of the prepositions should be added; so also in § 588.

Amongst good sections may be noted those on Nouns Defective and Variable, §§ 135-142, on Names of Persons, §§ 143-149, and on the Thematic Vowel, § 314. Commendable also is the use of the neuter participle in the principal parts, § 316, and the inclusion of compounds in the list of principal parts of verbs, § 347.

(To be concluded.)

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

R. G. KENT.

REVIEW

Six Greek Sculptors. By Ernest A. Gardner. London: Duckworth and Co.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons (1910). Pp. 260. \$2.00.

This new volume in the Library of Art, "the good red series", is not only a welcome companion to such works as Mrs. Strong's *Roman Sculpture*, Lethaby's *Mediaeval Art*, Lord Balcarras's *Donatello*, and Holroyd's *Michelangelo*, but it will serve to enhance the reputation of its author, who is already well known to classical scholars through his *Ancient Athens* (Macmillan, 1902) and his *Handbook of Greek Sculpture* (2nd edition Macmillan, 1907). The present volume is intended, like the

others of the series to which it belongs, to appeal to a larger circle of readers than the earlier works of the author.

Says Professor Gardner in his Preface:

There are probably many people who wish to acquire some grasp of the character of the chief sculptors without following the whole course of the history of Greek sculpture from its origins to its decadence; and there are others who desire to supplement what general outlines of this history they may have learnt by a more vivid realisation and appreciation of the leading artists.

One should not be misled, however, into supposing that because he is familiar with the earlier work of the author he can afford to neglect this latest volume. For, as will be pointed out, it contains many new and important criticisms as well as a number of new plates. Professor Gardner does not attempt in this volume, as he did in his *Greek Sculpture*, to give a complete history of the subject. He lays stress only upon the greatest artists and even in their case avoids discussion of work that can not be illustrated by extant remains. The six Greek sculptors chosen are, of course, Myron, Phidias, Polyclitus, Praxiteles, Scopas, and Lysippus. A chapter is devoted to each and the whole is preceded by an introductory chapter on the general characteristics of Greek Sculpture and another on Early Masterpieces; the chapter on Lysippus is followed by a brief discussion of Hellenistic Sculpture. Out of a total of 81 plates, 64 are new in the sense of not being found in the *Greek Sculpture*, and many of the subjects illustrated were not accessible at all before in works of a moderate price. Especial attention should be directed to the instructive Plate (1) of the Meleager head in the Villa Medici and the Graeco-Roman copy of the same in the Vatican. The Acropolis figure reproduced on Plate IV (No. 674 of the Acropolis Museum, Lechat's favorite) is a masterpiece of archaic art. The same may be said of the group of Heracles and the Cerynian stag (Pl. VI, from the Fouilles de Delphes). From the same source are the frieze of the Treasury of the Cnidians (Pl. V), the Agias (frontispiece), and head of Agias (Pl. LXVII). Especially valuable, too, are the six fine plates from Hamdy-Bey and Reinach's *Nécropole Royale à Sidon* (side of the sarcophagus of the Mourning Women; Alexander in combat, from the Alexander Sarcophagus; head of Alexander; head of a Persian; side of the Lycian Sarcophagus; and the two heads of Amazons from the same). These Amazonian heads are of special interest because of the high estimate which Professor Gardner puts upon them. Speaking of the Lycian Sarcophagus, he says (p. 115):

On one side of the sarcophagus is a group of horsemen employed in a boar hunt, who remind us irresistibly, in the ease of their bearing and the grace and variety of the design, of the Athenian

knights on the Parthenon frieze; on the other are Amazons in chariots at a lion hunt, and the heads of these figures give perhaps as beautiful an example as we possess of the Phidian type of head with its regular and simply modelled features; the richly waved hair, soft in texture, yet with no accidental disorder to distract us from the harmony of the whole design, is also comparable to that of the most careful work of the frieze. The discovery of such sculpture as this at Sidon shows us how far the influence of Attic art under Phidias had spread.

Among more recently discovered works of art, or those of which good illustrations are not readily accessible in our textbooks, should be included the fine recently discovered torso of the Discobolus of Myron in the Museo delle Terme, here combined with the Massimi head (Pl. XII: see footnote, p. 64); the head of Athena in the Jacobsen collection in Copenhagen (Pl. XX), of which Gardner says (88) that it "corresponds both to the description and copies of <the so-called Athena Promachos>, and also to what we should expect of the earlier work of Phidias"; the Phidian head of Zeus in Boston (Pl. XXVII); the head of the Diadumenus in Dresden, and the fine head of the same in the British Museum, which Mr. Gardner considers "the most faithful copy of the original"; the Polyclitan head from Beneventum in the Louvre (Pl. XL); the Kaufmann head in Berlin (Pl. XLVI); the superb Petworth head of the Phryne (or Aphrodite) of Praxiteles, of which our author says "If Phryne served as his model for the Aphrodite, this Petworth head may represent her later characteristics, as the Cnidian goddess corresponds to the first bloom of her womanhood"; the splendid, though mutilated, head of Heracles from Tegea, by Scopas (Pl. LI, after the *Bulletin de Correspondence Hellénique*); the Maenad in Dresden, regarded by the author as the most characteristic work of Scopas; the head of Artemisia and the head of Apollo from the Mausoleum; the Praxitelean Youth from Subiaco; and the Pergamene portrait head of a Warrior in the British Museum, as an example of Hellenistic work.

Special stress has been laid upon the excellent full page plates because of the vital importance of good illustrations in the study and teaching of art. Plates like those of the Petworth head, the head of the Demeter of Cnidus, the head of Heracles from Tegea, the Agias head, and the Youth from Subiaco set a new standard for books on Greek Sculpture.

In several instances Professor Gardner has changed his views since the issue of the revised edition of his *Greek Sculpture* in October, 1905. The Charioteer of Delphi, which he formerly inclined to attribute to Calamis, or at least to the Attic School (*Greek Sculpture*, p. 540; cf. Joubin, *La Sculpture Grecque*, Paris, 1901), he would now assign to the Aeginetan school, perhaps to Pythagoras of Rhegium.

The Wounded Amazon of the Capitoline type, which Furtwaengler attributed to Cresilas, Professor Gardner is now inclined to attribute to the Argive Phradmon (p. 136). The Townley Venus in the British Museum was not mentioned at all in his earlier work; he now speaks of it in connection with the Venus of Arles and the torso in Athens (Pl. XLVIII) and is inclined to accept Furtwaengler's theory that the original of all these was the Phryne of Praxiteles (p. 159).

Mr. Gardner is still reluctant (p. 113) to accept fully Furtwaengler's combination of the Bologna head with the Dresden torso as the Athena Lemnia of Phidias; he does, however, give a plate of the cast and another of the head. The Apoxyomenus of the Vatican, which, in common with most scholars, he had accepted as "admirably illustrating the proportions of Lysippus" (Greek Sculpture, p. 408), he now (p. 222) rejects "as only showing traces of his influence" and would place it along with the Praying Boy in Berlin and the Fighting Warrior of Agasias in the Hellenistic period. Instead of the Azara head in the Louvre, in which scholars were inclined to find the most representative copy of the portrait busts of Alexander by Lysippus, Mr. Gardner would now place the head from Alexandria in the British Museum (LXIX). In this head he finds a similarity to the Agias, especially in the eyes "set in deep at their inner corners"; he concludes his discussion by saying, "We need not hesitate to ascribe to Lysippus the original of a head which justifies the preference given by Alexander himself to his chosen sculptor".

It is a satisfaction to find Professor Gardner defending Greek Art from the popular prejudice against it as having "no individuality" (Ruskin). To refute this he cites such heads as the Meleager of the Villa Medici, the Demeter of Cnidus, and the head of a Persian from the Alexander sarcophagus (Pl. LXII). The truth is that what people are finding fault with is, in most cases, not Greek work at all, but miserable Roman copies.

There are occasional references to works of art of later periods, as when the lost Perseus of Myron is compared to the Perseus of Benvenuto Cellini, "which, indeed, has something Myronic about it" (p. 70), or when attention is called to the influence of the Victory of Samothrace on modern French sculpture (p. 247). In view of the constant demand made in these days to connect the ancient with the modern, one could wish that such comparisons were more frequent. The lost Ladas of Myron might be compared with the modern treatment of a like subject (a runner at his last gasp) in the Au But of Alfred Bouchier (cf. Sturgis, *Appreciation of Sculpture*, Pl. XXXV).

The only misprints noticed were in certain Greek

words in the footnotes: ΦΤΩΝ, for ΦΤΩΝ, p. 69 (cf. Overbeck, *Antike Schrift-Quellen*, No. 542), and γλυσθαί for γλυπεσθαί, p. 118.

Six Greek Sculptors is not intended to be a textbook, but it does offer attractive supplementary reading which should not be neglected by students of Greek Art. For the general reader it forms the best single-volume introduction to the subject in English, and this by an author whose long acquaintance with the subject, lucid style, and general discrimination and sanity of judgment make him a trustworthy guide.

MIAMI UNIVERSITY.

FRANK L. CLARK.

CORRESPONDENCE

In an editorial printed on February 3, Professor Lodge, speaking of the Latin requirements for secondary schools as defined by the New York State Education Department, writes that "they are much less reactionary than the modifications of Stanford University which allow Terence's Phormio in addition to the authors set by the commission".

In defence of the practice in California (the editorial might have added the University of California to Stanford University) I have only to say that in the light of pedagogical experience, whether in the classical or the modern language fields, it is a strange anomaly that a present-day commission should prescribe a course of Latin reading for schools which should almost completely ignore the colloquial or conversational element. We give our students a terrific dose of historical narrative which proves nauseating to many. The survivors are treated to a year of lofty rhetoric which sends even more into the invalid ranks. The few whose digestion still holds out are given a year of lofty poetry, and then, when that is consumed, for the most part drop gladly out of the ranks of Latin students.

Since the introduction into California schools of some simple Terentian dialogue (in a form in which ante-Ciceronian peculiarities are eliminated), some of us have seen distinct signs of a reawakened interest in Latin studies. Students entering college no longer have the rooted conviction or at least impression that Latin is a purely artificial language, used only for literary purposes, but never employed as the speech of daily life. They regard it as the living speech of a living people, and, for that as well as for other reasons, we in California should now regard it as distinctly and foolishly "reactionary" if we did not modify the Commission's requirements to the slight degree indicated by Professor Lodge.

I may add that our decision to recommend the Phormio was made before the publication of the Commission's report.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

H. R. FAIRCLOUGH.

We give here the menu of the dinner which formed part of the celebration of the One Hundredth Meeting of the Classical Club of Philadelphia (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 5.134).

CENA

SODALITATIS CLASSICAE

PHILADELPHICAE

Quanta pernis pestis veniet! quanta labe larido!
Quanta sumini absumedo! quanta callo calamitas!
Quanta laniis lassitudo! quanta porcinariis!—*Plautus*.

CONVENTUS CENTESIMUS

A. D. V. ID. FEB. MCMXII.

ORDO FERCULORUM

OSTREA EX SINU LYNNOFORTU

Ostrea callebat primo deprendere morsu.—*Juv.*

HELEOSELINON

OLIVAE

Qualia lassum pervellunt stomachum.—*Hor.*

IUS TESTUDINEUM CUM CREMORE LACTIS

Testudineum istum tibi ego grandibo gradum.—*Plaut.*

FRUSTA SOLEAE CUM IURE VINI ALBI

Nec satis est cara pisces averrere mensa

Ignarum quibus est ius aptius.—*Hor.*

SOLANA TUBEROSA NOVA

Ne tuberibus propriis offendat amicum.—*Hor.*

ASSUM BOVINUM TENERUM CUM FUNGIS RECENTIBUS

Pratensibus optima fungis

Natura est: aliis male creditur.—*Hor.*

FRUSTULA APII IN CONOS FORMATA

Sperandarum substantia rerum, argumentum non
apparentium.—*Paul.*

PERDICES OSTREIS FARTI

Quis non credat equum Graiam celasse phalangem,
Si perdix tantus parvus habet latebras?—*Incert.*

ACETARIA HERBARUM VIRIDUM

Si dura morabitur alvus,

....pellet obstantia....lapathi brevis herba.—*Hor.*

CASEUS

Sunt et caseoli, quos iuncea fiscina siccant.—*Verg.*

CREMOR LACTIS GLACIE CONCRETUS

Dissolve frigus.—*Hor.*

PLACENTAE LIBAQVE

Porcius infra,

Ridiculus totas simul absorbere placentas.—*Hor.*

CALICULUS

Nunc est bibendum.—*Hor.*

FUMISUGIA

FUMISUGIUNCULA

Omnis humi fumat Neptunia Troia!—*Verg.*

VINUM BURDIGALENSE

Siccis omnia nam dura deus proposuit, neque
Mordaces aliter diffugiunt solitudines.—*Hor.*

Ut iuvit te cena?

Sic ut mihi numquam

In vita fuerit melius.—*Hor.*

We owe to the kindness of Professor H. H. Yeames, of Hobart College, the following list of articles of value to classical students in periodicals which one does not naturally identify with classical interests. Similar lists will be welcomed at all times from any of our readers.

Athenaeum (London), January 13: The *Lysistrata* of Aristophanes (review of Rogers's edition and translation).

The Spectator (London), January 6: English Hexameters; Annals of Caesar (Letter from E. G. Sihler and reviewer's reply), January 13: English Hexameters; The Poetics of Aristotle (review of Margouliouth's edition).

The Nation (New York), January 11: The Philologists and Archaeologists (Pittsburgh meeting); The Religious Experience of the Roman People (review of W. Warde Fowler's book); January 25: Early Myths (review of Frazer's *Golden Bough*, Part 3); The Art of the Romans (review of H. B. Walters's book); Notice of F. F. Abbott's *The Common People of Ancient Rome* (in Notes).

London Times, Weekly Edition, January 5: Classics and the Average Boy; Roman Art (review of H. B. Walters's *Art of the Romans*); January 12: The Future of Greek (Leading Articles); Classics and the Average Boy (Letters to the Times); The Future of Greek (Home News).

The Atlantic Monthly (January): Julia D. Dragoumis: Under the Mulberries (the last of a series of picturesque stories of Greek island life, by a Greek lady); J. B. Carter: Rome and the Orient.

The Quarterly Review (January): A. W. Ward: The Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum.

The Hibbert Journal (January): Review of Adam's *Vitality of Platonism*.

Mind (October, 1911): R. Petrie: Aristophanes and Socrates.

In your issue of February 10 you comment on an article, entitled *The Classical Outlook*, in which I referred to the reply made by the Trustees of Amherst College to the Committee of the Alumni of the Class of 1885 as distinctly encouraging to the cause of the Classics. You affirm that, in your judgment, I have entirely misunderstood the action of the Trustees, that what they have given is almost a subterfuge and that it will not prove of any permanent value. While I admit that the Trustees might have gone farther and wish they had done so, it seems to me that you have underestimated the value of their action quite as much as I have overestimated it. I called the attention of President Harris of Amherst to your editorial, and, with his permission, send you the following extract from his reply: "The Trustees stated that four years' study of an ancient language are required for entrance and two years in college for the degree of Bachelor of Arts. Before the Class of 1885 addressed the Trustees, these requirements were made, and there is no change, except that after 1913 the degree of Bachelor of Science will not be given, but all must have an ancient language for entrance and two years of Latin or Greek in college. Nor has there been anything that is almost a subterfuge on the part of the Trustees. They say distinctly concerning Greek:

'It is to be regretted that the requirement of Greek cannot be made, since so few preparatory schools teach it. But the college believes in Greek, believes in its value for discipline, for the culture and for the wide horizon opened to the student by knowledge of the vital past on which the literature, the institutions, the life of to-day are founded, and without which they cannot be fully understood. To encourage the study of Greek, plans are being made to establish a classical lectureship, and a number of honorary scholarships for students fitted in Greek'.

I do not see any subterfuge in that. The lectureship is filled this year by Professor Gilbert Murray of the University of Oxford".

Would that all our colleges and universities were doing as much for the preservation and advancement of classical studies as Amherst!

BENJAMIN L. D'OOGHE.

MICHIGAN STATE NORMAL COLLEGE.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College, 525 West 120th Street, New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the language, the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY**), are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

Outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of **The Classical Weekly** is one dollar per year.

Editor-in-Chief

GONZALEZ LODGE, Teachers College, Columbia University

Managing Editor

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

Associate Editors

ERNEST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

HARRY L. WILSON, Johns Hopkins University

Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, books for review, queries, etc., should be sent to the Managing Editor. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

Caesar for Sight Reading

By Towle and Jenks

CLOTH .40

This book includes the most interesting portions of Caesar, and is so carefully edited that the class which has been well drilled on the first two books of the Gallic War will be able to read this readily and with pleasure. Special stress is laid on acquiring a vocabulary.

D. C. Heath & Company

Boston

New York

Chicago

HALE'S FIRST LATIN BOOK

Cloth, \$1.00

The book treats Latin as a living, growing, and changing language. It is this point of view that makes it appeal so strongly to the interest of the pupils. A knowledge of English Grammar is not taken for granted. Principles which are common to all languages are first presented. The order of the words is the Latin order from the opening sentence. Every new word is used immediately in at least two lessons. This feature of repetition and emphasis is found in no other First Latin Book. Pronouns follow one another in the order of their deviation from the normal type.

ATKINSON, MENTZER & GROVER

New York

Chicago

Boston

Dallas

Collar and Daniell's

First Year Latin

I have found Collar and Daniell's *First Year Latin* an excellent preparatory book. Its high rank and long-continued use are outward proofs of its inward merit.

W. Gear Spencer, Department of Latin,
Colgate Academy, Hamilton, N. Y.

GINN AND COMPANY

70 Fifth Avenue

NEW YORK

Noteworthy New Books

| | |
|---|--------|
| <i>Barss's Third Year Latin for</i> | |
| Sight Reading | \$0.40 |
| <i>Bishop, King and Helm's Cicero:</i> | |
| Ten Orations and Letters | 1.25 |
| Six Orations | 1.00 |
| <i>Janes's Second Year Latin for</i> | |
| Sight Reading | .40 |
| <i>Latin Sight Reading, Second Year</i> | .30 |
| <i>Nutting's A Latin Primer</i> | .50 |

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

Some copies of

Vol. III, No. 16, of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

which contains Mr. S. A. Hurlbut's
List of 600 Words for First Year Work
in Latin, are still obtainable.

Price 10 cents per copy; \$1.00 per dozen copies.

Address

PROFESSOR CHARLES KNAPP,
Barnard College, New York City.

WHY

Hodge's **CAESAR**—Macmillan Latin Series—
is making friends.

1. Approved German text—long vowels marked—punctuation after English usage.
2. Sight reading provided for books VI and VII.
3. General workmanship of the Series attractive and satisfactory. Valuable historical introduction—helpful maps—attractive illustrations.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

64-66 Fifth Ave.,

New York.

Boston.

Chicago.

Dallas.

San Francisco